

Gov. Doc.  
Can  
Com.  
T

Canada, Tourist Traffic, Standing Committee  
" 1949

1949

THE SENATE OF CANADA

CAI YC 18

- T57



PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

TOURIST TRAFFIC

No. 2

---

THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 1949

---

The Honourable W. A. Buchanan, Chairman

---

WITNESSES:

Mr. C. A. Walkinshaw, Toronto, Ontario.

Dr. A. W. H. Needler, Assistant Deputy Minister, Department of Fisheries.

Mr. D. Leo Dolan, Director, Canadian Travel Bureau, Department of Reconstruction and Supply.

APPENDIX "B"

Paper on The Estimated Value of Sports Fishing to Canada.

OTTAWA  
EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., B.A., LL.B.,  
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY  
CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY  
1949





MEMBERS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON TOURIST TRAFFIC

---

The Honourable W. A. BUCHANAN, *Chairman*

The Honourable Senators

Bishop	Dupuis	Murdock
Bouchard	DuTremblay	Paquet
Buchanan	Gershaw	Pirie
Crerar	Horner	Roebuck
Daigle	Mackenzie	Ross
Davies	McDonald	St-Père (22)
Dennis	McKeen	
Duffus	McLean	



## MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

Pursuant to adjournment and notice the Standing Committee on Tourist Traffic met this day at 10.30 a.m.

*Present:* The Honourable Senators:

Buchanan, *Chairman*; Bishop, Crerar, Duffus, Gershaw, Horner, Pirie, Roebuck and Ross.—9.

The committee resumed consideration of the Order of Reference of 17th March, 1949, authorizing the committee to inquire into and report upon the various agencies concerned with promoting tourist travel in Canada.

The official reporters of the Senate were in attendance.

Mr. C. A. Walkinshaw, Toronto, Ontario, was heard with respect to fishing as an attraction to tourist traffic in Canada; made suggestions for increasing the supply of fish in the lakes and rivers of Canada; offered suggestions for improving the accommodation and services for tourists; and was questioned.

Dr. A. W. H. Needler, Assistant Deputy Minister, Department of Fisheries, was heard with respect to the problem of maintaining a supply of game fish; outlined the methods of research being carried on by the Department of Fisheries to increase the production of fish; and was questioned.

Dr. Needler filed with the committee a paper on "The Estimated Value of Sports Fishing to Canada," which was ordered to be printed in the record. (*See Appendix "B"*).

Mr. D. Leo Dolan, Director, Canadian Travel Bureau, Department of Reconstruction and Supply, was heard in a review of the work of the Travel Bureau for the past year; gave an outline of the plans for the present year and how it is proposed that the appropriation for the Travel Bureau for the fiscal year 1949-50 be spent; and was questioned.

At 1 o'clock p.m. the committee adjourned to the call of the Chairman.

Attest.

H. ARMSTRONG,  
*Clerk of the Committee.*



## MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

THE SENATE

OTTAWA, Thursday, March 31, 1949.

The Standing Committee on Tourist Traffic, which was authorized to inquire into the tourist business, met this day at 10.30 a.m.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Our plan was to hear first from Mr. Dolan, but the suggestion has come from Senator Roebuck that we might hear Mr. Walkinshaw of Toronto concerning fishing. I thought we would have with us a representative from the Department of Fisheries; Dr. Bates, the Deputy Minister, promised to send someone. We have with us Dr. Solman of the Department of Mines and Resources. Senator Roebuck is better qualified than I to introduce Mr. Walkinshaw, so I will call on him for that purpose.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Mr. Chairman, I do not know that Mr. Walkinshaw has any official position or that he represents any constituency of fish, but he has pulled a lot of them out of the water. I have heard him tell many stories of his fishing experiences and his knowledge of fish. We are a tourist traffic committee and, as I said at one of our opening meetings, the biggest factor in tourist traffic is fish. Many tourists come here for nothing else but to fish and if they capture a few it adds greatly to the spice of their trip and they go home and talk about it. Mr. Walkinshaw is here at our request, and I can assure you that he is very familiar with the subject of fish. He is not a technical expert, but is a sportsman who has followed the sport of angling for years; he is a businessman and a citizen who enjoys the natural resources of our country. I now present Mr. Walkinshaw.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: There is an old saying that all fishermen are prevaricators.. Can you vouch for that?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: No, not if Mr. Walkinshaw tells about the fish he has caught.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Walkinshaw: as Senator Roebuck has said, this is a tourist traffic committee whose purpose is to promote the tourist trade in Canada. It is along those lines that we should like to hear any suggestions or observations you would like to make concerning fishing conditions. You may go ahead and tell your story as you wish.

Mr. C. A. WALKINSHAW: Mr. Chairman, it would be a hardy fisherman or any other person who would come before a group of grey-haired venerable gentlemen such as this to tell his story. I have no funny stories to tell but I just want to tell about my experience as a tourist fisherman—I have met hundreds of them.

The American tourists come here for a definite purpose. As Senator Roebuck has said, the majority of them come to fish; they bring a rod or two in every car; if they do not have a licence when they come, they soon purchase one. They come from their depleted waters and look upon Canada's lakes as a perfect haven for fishing. We might consider the private life, so-called, of the fish; their housing is a very important feature; the habitat has a very definite relation to fishing. Of course the Americans have good fishing too.

I have made a few notes to guide me, and if the honourable members will bear with me I should like to speak more as a fisherman than as a biologist. I have a feeling of good-will towards the Americans who come to visit Canada and

spend their money here. I feel their presence is good for all of us. It is from that point of view that I wish to talk this morning.

Hon. Mr. RÖEBCUCK: It is perfectly all right to read from notes; that is done all the time.

Mr. WALKINSHAW: If I may, I shall refer first to the question of licence fees, and in this respect I am speaking only of the province of Ontario. In this province the licence fees amount to about two and a half million dollars. That is the amount Americans pay in licence fees only and the sums they spend for other purposes amount to a great deal more.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: What percentage of that amount would you expect to be from American tourists?

Mr. WALKINSHAW: That is all from American source. We have no licence fee for our fishermen in the province of Ontario. The anglers have asked for it for a long time; we thought it would be a good thing for the province, but our government has never been prepared to make a licence fee. The reason we want to tax ourselves is that when a man wears a button or some identification showing that he has paid a licence fee, and we find him with thirty or forty small trout in his creel, we have some chance of reporting him, whereas, if he has no identification the average citizen does not get around to reporting him before he gets away.

The CHAIRMAN: On that point I wish to be clear. Do you say that the province of Ontario requires no licence fee for fishing?

Mr. WALKINSHAW: Not of any kind.

The CHAIRMAN: In Alberta, where I live, every citizen who fishes in the streams has to take out a licence.

Mr. WALKINSHAW: We have nothing like that here.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: A licence fee is also required in Saskatchewan.

Mr. WALKINSHAW: We believe that every man over sixteen years of age should pay some fee. We do not propose to keep the boys from fishing in the streams, but we feel that the fishermen in the lakes should make some contribution. There are some 200,000 anglers organized in clubs, and if these men paid a small fee it would make a nice nest-egg.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: You would require the fee to be used in re-stocking the lakes?

Mr. WALKINSHAW: Yes. We have appended that provision, that if a fee is collected it must be used for the propagation and the studying of the habitat of fish.

Hon. Mr. ROSS: How much do outsiders pay for a licence fee?

Mr. WALKINSHAW: The family licence is \$8.

Hon. Mr. ROSS: That is \$8 for the season?

Mr. WALKINSHAW: Yes, \$8 for the season.

Hon. Mr. RÖEBCUCK: Is that not pretty high?

Mr. WALKINSHAW: I do not think so. That may cover three or four fishing rods. The fee is \$5 for individuals. It is not any higher than any state in the union, and many states are higher.

Many Americans who come here inquire, "Where can I get a launch?" "Where can I get some bass?" or "Where can I find good muskies or pickerel?" Where are the places to go? Many Americans come back year after year, and I figure that they are giving Canada a large summer population of good paying guests. They have tremendous buying power and they spend a good deal of money here. They are only after the game fish: bass, pike and muskallonge. I do not intend to talk about any other fish because those I have named are the

only kind that they come for. Some tourists are quite happy if they catch crappie, pumpkinseed or mud pout. Some fishermen call that trash, but I have seen tourists in Rice Lake and the Kawartha Lakes figure they have had a good day after making a haul of pumpkinseed or, as some call them, sun fish. They are quite satisfied. There are also some dyed in the wool fishermen who want muskallonge and they will travel hundreds of miles to catch one. Incidentally, the record muskallonge was caught in the state of Wisconsin. It may surprise you to know this, but in the annals of American fishing, Canada holds only two records for the largest fish caught, one, the speckled trout and the other, the lake trout. They have large fish in the United States but still their citizens come over here to fish.

Many of our fishermen in our clubs and associations claim that we ought to restrict our fishing to Canadians. One of the reasons that I came here this morning was that the only other two men that I could suggest that might be able to tell you more than I could about this, are very much opposed to tourist traffic. This is perhaps a small idea, but they claim we should keep our fish in Canada. They claim the Americans have fished out their own waters and that is why they are coming here.

I have a different angle than that. I believe we can grow fish here. In other words, we can have our fish and eat them. If we grow fish in sufficient quantities we will have enough for the tourists as well as for ourselves. Americans are making big efforts to keep their fishermen at home. Millions of dollars are spent advertising fishing in all states. The advertising done in Michigan, Pennsylvania, Ohio and other eastern states is tremendous. The state of Wisconsin advertises its fishing facilities in practically every magazine. Therefore we must get the fishermen that want something that they have not got in the United States.

I know nothing of the economic factors of the tourist traffic other than the need for dollars, but I do think that the millions of dollars the tourists spend in both accessible and inaccessible waters are helping to keep up fishing for our local fishermen, through supporting the government hatcheries, and protection service; to say nothing of the better accommodation they enable the outfitters to provide. There are only one or two Canadians fishing in our rivers and lakes throughout the province to every hundred Americans. If any of you gentlemen went around the island of Manitoulin in the months of July and August you would think that the whole state of Ohio had moved over there. Lake of the Woods, Quetico, and Manitoulin get American tourists. Instead of restricting fishing by tourists, I would prefer to find out if we cannot grow the crop of fish they want. I would like to suggest what might be done. There is nothing new in these suggestions, but they must be made more effective and enlarged in operation.

What about these bass? Bass can be raised in ponds when the natural conditions and their spawning habits are maintained. This is being done artificially throughout the province. Many more such rearing ponds are required to restock heavily fished areas. Muskallonge are also raised easily to fingerling size in the hatchery by well-known methods; and the feeding of them to secure the size ready for release, about 9 to 12 inches in one year, has been accomplished satisfactorily in the one and only hatchery in this province. I take a little feeling of pride in the fact that perhaps I helped to get this muskallonge hatchery going. They told us for many years that we could not raise muskallonge in the province of Ontario. The biologists said that it was a food problem. I said "All right, supposing it is. We can raise minnows by the thousands". I tried raising them. I had twenty-four samples and I raised thousands of them in a little pond. I digress to tell you about this fact because this is the problem in

raising muskallonge, which is the choice fish of the American tourists. If he spends \$500 and catches one muskallonge he says "Look, I've caught a twenty-four pound muskallonge" and he goes away happy.

Lake trout, pickerel, and pike appear to be able to establish themselves, or at least to hold their numbers more satisfactorily. Intensive study is required on habitat conditions for the bass and muskallonge. We think the hatcheries are becoming outmoded. One or two American hatcheries have been closed and they claim the fish should be given a chance to hatch naturally. We have twenty-six or twenty-seven hatcheries in the province but we cannot scratch them all because some of them are commercial. I do want to point out, however, that people are now beginning to think that natural habitat is the thing to develop. If natural reproduction will not work sufficiently to the need, and it seems that it will not, we ought to know what lakes should be closed and for how long.

An illustration of benefit of research was contained in work recently done by Mr. Petersen of the Royal Ontario Museum. He has been doing research work on the moose. Funds for this work were supplied by an outside conservation body. It was not a government-sponsored project. Mr. Petersen found that people were calling for the closing of the moose season as a conservation measure. The moose were getting fewer all the time. He made an intensive study of the moose on an island in Lake Superior and he discovered that hunting is not the main factor, not even a large one, in the diminishing numbers of the moose. Food appears to be the limiting factor. There again it is a question of habitat. Apparently they consume about 50 pounds of food a day, and to get this food in the winter months is almost impossible in many areas. A survey showed that when the deer and moose could get food, they congregated. Their old enemy the wolves also congregated at the same time, but the healthy animals could cope with their predators. Therefore, it was proven that the wolves and hunting were not the biggest problems in the conservation of the moose.

There would be no need to advertise our fishing if we could promise two and a half pound bass to tourists. If, as the tourist outfitters of Northern Ontario say, one moose is worth \$1,000 to them, I think each musky in our waters is worth \$100, and each bass about \$10, from a tourist's point of view. The muskallonge are our largest and gamest sport fish. The muskallonge is the best fighting inland fish in the world, and we have all the muskies there are in the world. However, these fish are disappearing rapidly. Where you could catch two or three in a day at one time you can only catch one in a week now. I know because I have fished for them. Of the twenty-six or twenty-seven hatcheries in the province, only one is raising muskallonge.

Big pike in the Georgian Bay waters are a huge asset, but there are thousands who fish bass in this area from July 1st to the closing day, every day of the week. The pressure is tremendous. I was fishing in the Georgian Bay last summer and I know that the pressure all along the bay is terrific. Most persons fishing were American tourists.

Most of our national parks are handling as many tourists as the present conditions, that is, boats, guides and accommodation, will permit. The tourist is prepared to pay well for his fun. Not many of them are hollering about the fish but they are hollering about having better guides, better boats, better meals and better accommodation. They particularly want better guides and I think they are entitled to them. Some method of standardization of guides and fees and penalties for gross overcharging is required. There is a lot of overcharging done. Strict supervision of all guides is necessary, and only licensed guides should be allowed to act for pay. The tourist does not mind paying good money for a good guide. I remember paying \$17 for an Indian guide and I did not mind it at all because we went out and caught a lot of pike in Georgian Bay,

but I would mind paying \$8 or \$9 to a man who does not know anything about his work. The Lake of the Woods, Manitoulin and Algonquin Park, the Kawarthas, Haliburton and Muskoka are well known areas to Canadians, but one of our great and lovely parks is not so well known to Canadians—the Quetico Superior. The United States government is anxious to join Canada in protecting this park, to keep its wilderness character intact and to preserve the beauty spot as a memorial to the men who died in both world wars. You will be hearing more about this before long.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Where is this park located?

Mr. WALKINSHAW: In the Lake of the Woods area, with the state of Minnesota on one side and the province of Ontario on the other. The United States has made a tremendous effort in connection with this project. Twenty-four million Saturday Post readers have been given an idea of its possibilities, along with hundreds of other periodical readers throughout the country. A splendid movie on this project will shortly be available in 16 millimeter film. This unique area should be left as real wilderness, available to canoe travel only. In other words, we want to remove travel by motor boats. No attempt is being made to hamper mining or lumbering but it is desired that the timber be left by the water's edge. It is desired to conserve this area as one place in Ontario where a man can go and find things in their natural state, without finding hot dog stands or cottages and so on.

I wish to mention that the revenue from the Algonquin Park is about \$22,000 a year, which is not very much; from Quetico the revenue is about \$6,400; and between \$10 and \$12 million is left by tourists on the American border of this area each year. We could invite them into this district, which is Canada's only real wilderness area.

I refer now to the question of the water levels in the tourist areas; this is of course within the jurisdiction of the Dominion government. As you know lumbermen in the spring want the water level raised eight, twelve or fourteen feet to float their logs down. The raising of the water level is something which the Dominion government should supervise most carefully.

The revenue from hunting in Ontario has been growing recently. Thousands of moose and deer are exported each year. In our Ontario law we have a proviso which allows the collection of a bounty on bear. Many of the tourists like to see bear; the average person knows that few of them would hurt anybody. I think it would be a great pity to pay a bounty on this animal. The figures are quite interesting: In 1946-47, some 946 bear were killed, and 509 were killed in 1947-48; 327 of this latter number were taken by tourists. That shows that the bear is definitely a tourist attraction. Ontario proposes to prohibit the hunting of moose for two years, in order to study the situation and determine what is happening to this animal.

To sum up, I would say that we are compelled at once to look into the private lives of our game fish. Much more moneys should be spent on research on at least two fishes, and the habitat of all our game fish. If the senators' committee could get this need across to the authorities it would be the finest contribution it could make to tourist traffic. I understand that the responsibility for Canadian fish is an involved question, and I do not propose to discuss it. But if the provincial governments will not or cannot spend enough money for research concerning the game fish population, then the federal government must be prepared to step in. The provinces are in charge of our game and wild life, but if they fail to make a proper provision the federal government will have to give some assistance.

There should be a closure of more lakes for short periods of time, perhaps one to three years, to allow the breeding stock to recover. Too, guides and resort owners should be more tourist conscious from the point of view of service. Much

better accommodation is required. The interior of Quetico Superior country, including the Quetico provincial park area, should be declared and kept a wilderness area for the benefit of Canadians and Americans particularly. It is the last remaining wilderness area in this province. Further, I believe that typical Canadian dishes should be served at hotels and tourist resorts. We have in this country lovely fish, maple syrup, and fruit, yet we are compelled to eat dry, tough beef; white fish, pickerel and lake trout could just as easily be served; also, far too much canned goods is offered to tourists. This morning at the hotel I had a breakfast of lake trout, which is the finest I have eaten in a long time. Not nearly enough fish is served in this country. Another improvement in the tourist service would be to supervise, license and train our guides. The average guide does not know enough to wash his hands before he serves you dinner; you have to tell him the second time, and then he does not use soap. Only two provinces in Canada are doing any research on Canadian fish. This enterprise should be greatly extended.

I should like to see in Canada more Canadian ensigns and flags displayed. Perhaps this does not mean so much to us, but it gives us a national conscience, and the tourists like it.

There should be consideration given to the regulation of tourists and others landing in Canada by air for fishing and hunting. Regulations have already been undertaken by Ontario, and should be under consideration in other provinces. For instance, tourists were flying into the James Bay area to look for geese and ducks. So much flying was done and so many planes were overhead that it was found that the geese and ducks who came to rest on the flight between Ellesmere Island and Central America were disturbed and flew on before they were properly rested. The Ontario government had to step in and restrict the flying over this area; it provided a landing area, beyond which planes were not allowed to go. In one area geese and moose were being hunted by plane.

Something should be done to save the ducks and geese who are being lost because of oil slicks in the St. Lawrence River and Niagara River. I do not know how the problem can be avoided, but it appears that when the birds light on the oily water it is impossible for them to take off and fly again. Thousands of birds have died as a result of this oily substance.

Strict regulations should be made for the use of spring and air guns in the hands of boys, with a view to saving our owl and hawk population. Many tourists like to hunt the wild life with a camera; they are not interested in fishing or hunting, but take a great deal of pleasure in taking pictures. These birds should be free to fly about to the enjoyment of the naturalist who gets more fun out of taking their picture than shooting them.

To preserve the beauty of our scenery we must impress upon the government the need for regulating and cutting of timber along the shorelines in the recreational areas. When logs are left in streams long enough, they create a pollution. The spruce bud worm causes enough trouble without cutting our timber down to the water. Large corporations hesitate to clean up the waters and continue to dump much foreign matter from pulp and paper, and other mills. Unfortunately, the people who do this thing regard themselves as important, and disregard the damage they do.

We in Canada should attempt to cash in on our colourful past. I think we have something to gain by having our guides dress in a more colourful style. We have the background of the French coureurs de bois, lumberjacks and our own Paul Bunyans. Guides should not look like city bums, wearing a pair of sneakers, an old suit and a dirty sweater. If they would wear a pair of higher boots, roll their socks down over the top of them, and put on a colourful checked shirt, they would look the part. One often hears a tourist remark about a guide who is smartly dressed.

I have covered my points, some of which may not mean much. On the other hand, I have expressed a few ideas which I hope may be acted upon by the members of this committee.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Did you ever catch a fish with a haywire snare?

Mr. WALKINSHAW: Never.

The CHAIRMAN: This talk, Mr. Walkinshaw, has been most interesting and thought-provoking. As to the procedure we will follow, since Mr. Walkinshaw has been talking about fishing it might be appropriate to hear from a representative of the Department of Fisheries concerning research and other matters, then we could hear Mr. Dolan. First, I wish to ask a question of Mr. Walkinshaw. You said that only two provinces carried on research into fish. What provinces do you refer to?

Mr. WALKINSHAW: Ontario and British Columbia are, I believe, the only provinces which have any extensive research. Of course I am not as familiar with the other provinces.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: You mentioned the problem of hunters flying into certain areas in Canada. During the last two years there has been a considerable amount of flying into the caribou country. I was on the train from Regina recently, and I talked to some American hunters who had shot their quotas. One fellow said he had picked up a caribou at 2 o'clock and was in Regina that night at 6 o'clock. They had a camp there, which was run by the government, and they were shooting in the caribou country. At that rate, our game will not last long.

Mr. WALKINSHAW: No country can stand that kind of pressure. I may say again that a great many sportsmen do not agree with me at all. They think we are selling ourselves down the river. On the other hand, Americans have come over here to address our clubs and organizations and have told our people that they are fools for selling everything for nothing. They claim that we are charging too little while giving access to the best we have. Americans are flying to our fishing locales now, and they make the trip in very short time.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: As far as flying up for caribou is concerned, these people do not spend much money. They just hire a plane in the United States and they do not stop over at all in this country. They just travel to the place and pick up their caribou and go back home.

Mr. WALKINSHAW: You can imagine how plentiful fish are in a small lake that has never been fished in. Well, when somebody comes in by aeroplane and offers bait to these fish, he can clean out the best in a single day. By permitting this sort of thing, Canada gets nothing out of the traveller except a licence fee.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: I was particularly interested in what you had to say about meals for tourists. Americans have told me that they have received much better and less expensive meals on their own railroads than they do here. Our railways have increased the cost of their meals by 100 per cent in the last two years, and the Americans claim that the quality is not as good as they get on the American trains. I think the tourists should be given some of our native grown food rather than canned stuff. It would be a treat for them. Americans will put up with poor accommodation without too much complaint, but they do expect good meals. They get good meals in their own country and they want them here.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: The suggestion of training guides, registering them, and seeing that they behave themselves and give good service for their money, seems to me to be a practical idea that could be easily carried out.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: What about classifying the guide as first or second class on his licence?

Mr. WALKINSHAW: They are hoping to make the guide situation much better in this province. It might be a difficult thing to reach a standardization of fees because some work much harder than others. There are guides who would take parties out for one day and there are others who travel with a party for one or two weeks and they have to know how to feed the people, take care of the camp, and so on. As long as a guide gives full value I do not think it makes much difference what he is charging. Americans are accustomed to paying high prices in their country but they are also accustomed to receiving full value for their money. I went on a two-week trip through Algonquin Park and had a woodsman as a guide. He cut his foot. A man can make a mistake like that, but he was useless to me for four or five days of the trip. We had to look after him and all he could do was paddle the canoe. It seems to me that he was not quite as good a guide as he should have been.

Hon. Mr. GERSHAW: I think the idea of having special clothing is important.

Mr. WALKINSHAW: I think so too.

Hon. Mr. GERSHAW: The colourful uniform of the Mounted Police has been quite an attraction to the American tourist.

Mr. WALKINSHAW: You would be surprised how many people mention that fact. If the resort owners were wise perhaps they would see that those who work for them wear certain uniforms with a special cap or sash or something to distinguish them as guides. I think the American tourist would go for that.

Hon. Mr. PIRIE: I think a lot can be done to educate the guides, but I doubt very much whether you can grade them as Grade 1 or Grade 2. I think if these suggestions were put before a guides' association meeting—we have one in the province of New Brunswick—it would serve a good purpose. If they were encouraged in this way to have more pride in their work, I think it would be more to the point than by trying to grade them.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I was talking to a scientist from the United States. I am sorry we cannot bring him here, but he told me that the problem of fish, as has been stated by Mr. Walkinshaw, is habitat. The two points as far as habitat is concerned are food and air. I do not know anything about the food problem except that the base of the food must be vegetables. This scientist told me, and it struck me forcibly because I did not know anything about it myself, that the great limiting feature of our fisheries in the settled part of the country is the oxygen in the air of the lakes. When people are around lakes they throw things into it. That refuse is oxidized by the water. It goes to the bottom of the lake and the water there becomes deoxidized. The oxygen is taken from the water and therefore from the fish. He told me that the water in our lakes turns over twice a year, once in the spring and once in the fall. If you rob the lower stretches of the water where the sewage and so forth finds its way, the fish cannot survive in that water. Furthermore, our most valuable fish are the ones that live in cool waters and, as soon as the warm water of the upper region of the lake meets the deoxidized water of the lower region, the fish are killed. He also said that fish are so prolific that if you make it possible for them to live and thrive, the supply of fish can hardly be depleted because one fish will populate a lake, providing his progeny grows and lives to maturity. Mr. Walkinshaw, what can you tell us about his remarks?

Mr. WALKINSHAW: Our game fish are carnivorous and live on other fish. That is what makes them the sporting fish they are. Perhaps the most carnivorous fish is the muskallonge and the pickerel and they both thrive on smaller fish. You can catch trout in smaller areas by using fly bait, but these fish are also meat eaters and they want meat. I think that is a limiting feature. As far as deoxidizing the water is concerned, running water will oxidize itself.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes, running water oxidizes itself and that is why you find trout in running streams. The scientist to whom I referred suggests that a windmill should pump air down and keep the water turning over all year round.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: It is a strange thing but some lakes that would appear to have more fish than others do not have as much. For instance, there is a lake called Jackfish Lake which is situated north of North Battleford. That lake has been fished commercially for over forty years. A man who had been with the Saskatchewan government for years and who knew a lot about fish was lecturing to our school children. He told them that it was not right to cut down the timber that lies close to the lakes. I said to him later, "What puzzles me is that, while you have talked about woods being necessary around lakes and so on, why is it you mentioned a lake up north where the quota allowed was only 50,000 pounds while 200,000 pounds are taken from Jackfish Lake which is surrounded by prairie for the most part of the shore line?" He explained that in Jackfish Lake there was a larger area of spawning ground. He said that where you have a lake where there may be food, the main part in the protection of the fish is a large area of spawning ground. In a lake where there is a smaller spawning ground the eggs are laid in one mass, whereas if there is plenty of room the fish move forward and a larger number of eggs are fertilized. That is how this man explained the great production in Jackfish Lake. I remember one year when the quota in that lake was 225,000 pounds and the men were out on the lake with all their equipment, and in two days the government had to stop the fishing because they had gone over their quota. The fishing in that lake was just as good last year as it was forty years ago. That is an amazing thing. There must be something in the water in that lake that suits the type of fish there. It is an amazing lake for what it has produced in money. The whitefish taken from the lake is directly shipped to New York. I should like to digress for a moment to tell a little story. Up in Meadow River, near Meadow Lake in Northern Saskatchewan, someone suggested that we do a little fishing. I said "Well, how can we do that? We have no tackle." He just picked up a piece of haywire and said, "We don't need any fishing tackle." He put a loop in the wire and held it in the water where it was about three feet deep. If a small fish started to go through he would let it continue on its way, but when a big fish came along and went to go through he would pull the wire tight when the fish had passed half way through, and in this way he would catch the fish. Let me tell you that we caught quite a few fish by using that method. One fellow caught a whole truck load.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any more questions to ask Mr. Walkinshaw? Thank you very much, Mr. Walkinshaw. We shall now ask Dr. Needler to come forward.

Dr. A. W. H. NEEDLER, Assistant Deputy Minister, Department of Fisheries: Mr. Chairman and honourable gentlemen, the Fisheries Research Board of Canada, as you know, is a branch of the Department of Fisheries, and the direction of its work is under the Department of Fisheries itself. In the fundamentals I think that the federal government has responsibility for the maintenance of fish stocks everywhere, but it has delegated that responsibility to the provinces in a number of cases. Ontario, I think in the nineties, Quebec in 1921, and the Prairie Provinces later still when their natural resources were transferred to them, took responsibility for the maintenance of stocks of fresh water fish.

Hon. Mr. Ross: That would not apply to the parks portion.

Dr. NEEDLER: No—except the parks. The federal government has continued to take active responsibility—it still has a kind of a dormant responsibility for all fish...—but it continues to take an active responsibility as far as anadromous fish (e.g. salmon which are game fish) are concerned, and as far as fresh water

species in the Maritime Provinces are concerned. Consequently the research has been concentrated in those fields, and the Fisheries Research Board, through its establishments on the Pacific and the Atlantic coasts, has carried on research on the maintenance of salmon stocks and trout stocks. Those species are selected perhaps largely as an accident of geography, because they are the species that are important in the areas where the federal government is still taking the active responsibility.

I listened with a great deal of interest to Dr. Walkinshaw's very sound exposition. I think that one of the points that comes clearly from what he said and from the comments made on what he said, is that the problem of maintaining the fish stocks is an extremely complex one, and if one were to discuss the research programs in detail one could go on almost indefinitely. So I think, sir, it would be better for me to answer inquiries rather than to try to give a general account of the research that we are doing. But I will do just as you want.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: The federal government still look after the fish in all the national parks?

Dr. NEEDLER: Yes.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: What do you say as to this oxidization of water?

Dr. NEEDLER: That is an important factor. In order to comment on it, the complexity of the subject comes up again. One of the panaceas which has been advocated is fertilization. There are no panaceas; there is no method of increasing fish stocks which is applicable everywhere.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: What do you mean by "fertilization"?

Dr. NEEDLER: Fertilization of water; that is to say, adding nutrient salts to increase the food supply. The importance of the oxygen content of the water to certain species of fish is very great. It has come in as a factor limiting the value of fertilization, because as you said, when there is pollution and you increase the amount of oxidizable material in the water, it uses up oxygen. The same thing occurs when you increase the amount of food material in a lake and you have conditions in the winter when there is not a good source of oxygen because, perhaps, of lack of open water in the streams or the length of time for which a lake remains completely frozen. In the experiments we have carried on recently in fertilization, we have found that lakes which have been proved to be barren, in the sense that they had a low production in spite of a good reproduction of fish, when they were fertilized, the growth of the fish was improved. But even a moderate fertilization led to oxygen lack in the winter to a dangerous level; and that has been the experience of others who have investigated the problem thoroughly.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Have they ever investigated the adding of oxygen?

Dr. NEEDLER: I don't believe that anybody has ever studied the problem of adding oxygen, at least not to natural water.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Or "aerating" is another way of expressing it.

Dr. NEEDLER: They do it in hatcheries, in small ponds, but I don't think anybody has ever thought of attempting it in natural waters. That may be a lack of imagination rather than a practical impossibility.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Well, nobody suggested it but myself, and it may be a foolish suggestion. But why would not a windmill pump water down in the bottom of the lake and keep it up, keep the water turning up, bringing the water up; by supplying a little air it would rise as the bubbles went through it; with almost no cost beyond a little equipment, such as an iron pipe.

Dr. NEEDLER: It might be possible in some lakes, but there are some in which, perhaps, it would not be desirable to bring the bottom water up, because

that is the water where the oxygen is poor. I mean it would still remain a complicated problem.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: But as soon as that water came to the top it would be exposed to the air. It is only from the surface water that you get any oxygen.

Dr. NEEDLER: That is true.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: What would happen in winter when that lake was frozen over?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Well, I don't know. I don't know anything about it. I am inquiring; that is all.

Dr. NEEDLER: I think it is in winter that the lack of oxygen usually kills fish in lakes.

The CHAIRMAN: From your acquaintance with inland fishing do you find there is a depletion in fish life going on all the time, at least a depletion exceeding the production through the hatchery system and natural growth?

Dr. NEEDLER: Well, sir, we come to the complexity of the problem again. There is no doubt that in some areas the amount of fishing is in excess of the supply, at least to the extent that when you have the number of people trying to fish that are now trying to fish, there are not enough fish to go around. There are a great many cases where people consider that there has been over-fishing. Actually, the total number of fish taken is almost what it was before, and sometimes greater, but when there are so many people catching them, the individual angler gets fewer. The question of reproduction which you bring in is one of the factors. There would be some lakes or streams in which other factors were limiting reproduction; in other words where the food supply or the environmental conditions, oxygen and so forth, or the activities of predators, whether they are fish or birds, are limiting the supply in spite of adequate reproduction. There are more instances of that kind, I think, than there are of cases where there is a real failure in reproduction. Mr. Walkinshaw gave his opinion that hatcheries were outdated, but I think it would be truer to say that some years ago hatcheries were regarded as the panacea, as the formula for assuring a high production of fish everywhere, and that there was on this continent more than anywhere else a big expansion in fish hatcheries, whether or not provided by government, but in the last decade or two it has been quite clear that, instead of hatcheries being valuable in all waters and with all species, there are only certain waters where the natural reproduction is insufficient—that is, it is our opinion that there still are waters, even in the case of trout, where natural reproduction is insufficient to make full use of the capacity of waters to increase, and in those cases—

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Do you think the hatchery is necessary in those cases?

Dr. NEEDLER: In those cases, and only in those cases.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: There are some lakes where the eggs will not mature, not develop, but small fish put in do all right. We have a lake in Saskatchewan where for years and years there was no fish. They stocked it with white fish, and they have done exceptionally well, they take ten-pounders now, beautiful fish. They have been making a study for the last two or three years, and they have come to the conclusion that there is no reproduction taking place in the lake. We considered the water too alkaline for fish for years, but the small fish were put in, in that case, and the only way we could have fish in that lake would be by small fish from the hatchery.

Dr. NEEDLER: That is true.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: That is the type of lake where it would be necessary to still continue?

Dr. NEEDLER: Where the reproduction of young fish is inadequate, either because of water conditions in the lake or the lack of spawning grounds, as was mentioned. In those cases hatcheries are still of value. So far there has not been a really adequate assessment of our waters from that point of view, so I do not think it can be said anywhere that the products of our hatcheries are used to the best advantage; and that is where your investigation of the environment comes in. We need to know.

Mr. WALKINSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I was not implying that hatcheries are not needed or of no use. I think they are splendid. I think I should have said, if I did not say so, that these hatcheries in the United States were being discarded rather extensively in some of the States. Here we are quite proud of our hatcheries, but, as far as game fish are concerned, I do not think perhaps they are the most important item. Do you agree with me there?

Dr. NEEDLER: Yes, I think we agree exactly. The hatcheries are useful in some instances, but they are not the most important single factor.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions? We want to get to Mr. Dolan as soon as possible.

Hon. Mr. PIRIE: I would like to ask Dr. Needler a question about the netting of salmon at the mouths of the rivers, when they come in in the spring of the year to the mouth of the Miramichi and the Bay of Fundy. Do you think that is depleting the salmon that gets up our fish rivers for spawning?

Dr. NEEDLER: Well, you have opened a very controversial question. I would say frankly that we do not really know, and there are two sides of the question. We have done quite a bit of research on methods of increasing the production of small salmon, and we have some knowledge of the movements of salmon in the sea, but we have very little definite knowledge of the number of salmon that apparently are necessary to make full use of rivers. Now it is quite obvious, of course, that if the commercial fishermen catches a fish, that fish won't be caught by an angler, even if it would have been. I think it is also true that the commercial fishermen catch a lot of fish that would not be caught otherwise; commercial fisherman generally are catching quite a proportion of salmon that, when they are marked, do not appear in any angler's catch. I would go so far as to say that it is a really important matter from the standpoint of the commercial fisheries in salmon rivers to know more about that subject. We have plans under way now, if we are given the funds, to make an attack on the problem of how many salmon are required to seed a river naturally.

Hon. Mr. PIRIE: Did I understand you to say, Doctor, that certain salmon would never take a fly in fresh water?

Dr. NEEDLER: I did not mean that. The netting that has gone on near the mouth of rivers does not necessarily catch only salmon which are on their way into rivers at that time. For example, the Miramichi drift net fisheries and the Margaree trap net fisheries, near the mouths, have shown that quite a proportion of the salmon are going elsewhere; consequently, one cannot say that salmon caught near the mouth of a river are on their way up and are being removed from the potential angler.

Hon. Mr. PIRIE: But they are on their way up some fresh water river?

Dr. NEEDLER: Yes, I would think so. They are not necessarily on their way up a river where the number of salmon is limited to the angler. The number of salmon available is not the only factor that limits the angling; there is the question of the water flow that brings the fish in at the right time, and the conditions under which they will take the hook.

Another point that should be considered about the relationship between the commercial fisheries and angling is that there has been wide natural fluctuation in the abundance of salmon in recent years. In Northern New Brunswick the salmon have been at a pretty low ebb; it must be remembered that they were at

a low ebb within the last century, and they increased again. It is very difficult to assess the extent to which these natural fluctuations are responsible for the scarcity. It might be unjust to commercial fishermen, who make their livelihood from fishing, to assume that the reason salmon are scarce is because they are catching too many in the sea. Statistics of commercial fisheries and angling when taken together—though they are not as good as they should be—indicate that the two go up and down together, rather than being complementary to one another. Of course, they might go down because too many fish are being caught and still fluctuate together. However, we are left with the fact that at one time in the past, when the fishery was at a lower level than it is now, the salmon became scarce. Then they came back and later became scarce again. So it remains an open question.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Dr. Needler, what is your opinion on the suggestion that rivers are being polluted by big companies, such as pulp companies, who dump effluvia into the water?

Dr. NEEDLER: I think it is undoubtedly true that the rivers may be polluted, and that it is well established that in some cases it has done damage. The big problem in approaching any case of pollution is to decide which of the two alternatives is the more costly to the community. It is a question of whether it is more beneficial to the community to prevent pulp companies—and they do not want to lose pulp in the water—from dumping substance into the water, or to preserve the fishing. In other words, is it a greater loss to the community to lose the angling or the pulp business. I think a fair analysis of the situation would show that it might cost the community as a whole considerable to force the pulp people to cease their operations and keep fine materials from going in the water.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I do not think it is pulp but rather chemical by-products that are being dumped.

Dr. NEEDLER: That is true: it is sometimes pulp and other times chemical by-products and certain large materials. Continual effort is made to keep pollution to the minimum which the traffic can stand.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I am told that if the companies would dump their by-products into sand, to be filtered before reaching the water, that would be a solution to the problem.

Hon. Mr. PIRIE: Dr. Needler, there are a great many outboard motors being used on fresh water rivers where salmon spawn. Do you think the operation of these motors is a hindrance to the life of the fish?

Dr. NEEDLER: Do you mean that it makes them less likely to take the hook?

Hon. Mr. PIRIE: No, I mean would the fish go to rivers where there is a considerable noise from these motors and an oil scum forming on the water from exhaust?

Dr. NEEDLER: I have no definite knowledge of this subject, but I would think that the noise from an outboard motor would not be a serious factor.

Hon. Mr. PIRIE: Do you not think that the pollution from oil dripping from the motors and smoke from the exhaust would have a detrimental effect on the life of the fish?

Dr. NEEDLER: I think it is usual that when outboard motors are used, the streams are fairly large, and I would doubt that the volume of pollution would be great enough to be detrimental.

The CHAIRMAN: Would the committee wish to discuss the fish question further, or should we now hear from Mr. Dolan? We have one or two others from whom we could hear later on. What is the wish of the committee?

Hon. Mr. PIRIE: We will hear Mr. Dolan now.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Needler.

Dr. NEEDLER: May I make one suggestion before leaving? I have here a report made in 1944 by a Joint Committee of the Fisheries Reserve Board and the National Research Council. It took two or three years to prepare, and should perhaps be called to the attention of the committee. It is called "The Estimated Value of the Sports Fishing to Canada", and consists of three pages. If the members of the committee are interested I can make it available to them.

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we could add it to our report and have it published. Would the members of the committee be agreeable to that procedure?

Some Hon. Senators: Yes.

(For report see appendix at end of today's proceedings.)

The CHAIRMAN: We will now hear from Mr. Dolan. You have been before us previously, Mr. Dolan, and you know what we want.

D. Leo DOLAN (Canadian Travel Bureau): Yes, Mr. Chairman. As you know, I do not usually prepare any large submission, but I try to tell you each year what the record shows of the activities of the Canadian Government Travel Bureau.

Last year, 1948, we had our largest tourist year in the history of Canada, with a greater number of people and an expenditure reaching the all-time high of \$282 million. I propose to tell you briefly what part the federal government played in that field. We do not claim to have been altogether responsible for the big year, but with typical humility we claim to be responsible for most of it. To give you some idea of the activities of the federal tourist bureau in the past few years, I shall present a few statistics.

Last year, for instance, the Bureau handled some 276,000 direct tourist inquiries, of which ninety-eight per cent was the result of advertising and publicity campaigns carried on by the department. That figure can only be made intelligible by stating that there are now three bureaus in the United States which, combined, handled the number of tourist inquiries that we did in Ottawa last year. It is quite easy to prove that there is no tourist bureau in the world replying to as many inquiries as we do. Our increase last year over the previous year was 131 per cent, and as a result our staff had to be increased to handle the volume. Today we have a staff of about 70, and last year we sent out tourist literature totalling 1,759,929 pieces.

For instance, if we receive an inquiry from a man in Akron, Ohio, one letter does not suffice to answer him. He may ask us about some of the features of which Mr. Walkinshaw and Dr. Needler have been telling us. He may ask about fishing, or scenic resorts; the supplying of an answer may necessitate five or six operations within our department. The figure of 70 in respect of staff is an increase over last year, but it must be remembered that the bureau is purely a service organization and has to have a large number of people to answer these inquiries. We are getting more inquiries per day now than we did a year ago, which is a fairly reliable barometer of the potential business in 1949. Last year I was bold enough to predict that 1948 would be our biggest tourist year in the history of Canada. I think now that 1949 will be equally as big, assuming that we can use the number of people writing to us as a barometer. We are now receiving an average of 1,664 inquiries a day.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: You have heard the aphorism that the best reward for work well done is more work to do.

Mr. DOLAN: That being so, I am "Exhibit A" in truth of that statement, Senator Roebuck. Last year, in answer to inquiries, we sent out some 6,500 bags of mail. We sent out 35 to 40 bags of mail every day. During the month of January of this year, when our advertising was running in the United States, we received 13,943 inquiries. In February we received some 36,000 inquiries, making an increase of 42 per cent for these months.

Hon. Mr. BISHOP: Would the larger part of the inquiries come from people seeking information about hotel accommodation?

Mr. DOLAN: Everything is included. It is a wide variety of things. They may ask for a highway tour through any part of Canada, or for accommodation in a large or small place. They may ask for fishing information. It is really amazing the number of things they do ask about. Some of the letters are rather amusing. I have one letter here which asks for a suitable place for a honeymoon outside of a city but not too far because the bride is easily frightened by wild animals. When anybody asks me what inquiries are made I usually have something like this to take out of our files. I have a letter here from a road builder in the United States who travelled through Canada last year. He made some reference to the fishing that was not too nice, but he went on to say that he built highways in Ohio and he described how we should build roads in Canada. It is a three-page letter, single spaced. The American people are very prolific writers. When they tell us that our roads are terrible—and there is a lot of truth in that—they do so in a nice way. This man told us that because our roads were so bad he had to put a lot of repairs on his car when he returned to the United States. He told us of the highway he built for the government of Ohio and he told us how to build a road here. I sent the letter to the Departments of Highways. These inquiries nearly all come from the result of our advertising. We extended our advertising very considerably because the government has been good enough to provide our department with more money.

The CHAIRMAN: Could you tell us the appropriation for the department and how the money is being spent?

Mr. DOLAN: Most is spent on advertising.

Hon. Mr. Ross: You spoke of 42 per cent more inquiries this year. What is that compared to?

Mr. DOLAN: That is over last year, and is for the first three months of this year. We shall have an appropriation in 1949-50 of \$1,298,000. A year ago we had an appropriation of \$1,038,000. We have been given an increase of about 25 per cent in our appropriation this year. One reason for this is that the advertising costs have gone up. They have particularly been increased in the United States. The cost of printing has increased, the paper costs have gone up, and this has resulted in an overall increase in advertising to almost the same degree as the increase we received from the government.

We have found out that our advertising should be done in colour in the larger magazines. We have extended our colour advertising because we have found that there is tremendous competition for tourists on the North American Continent. This competition is increasing year by year. A few years ago when this Bureau was organized, as the result of recommendations from this committee, there were only ten or twelve states in the United States that had tourist appropriations. Today 44 of the 48 states of the Union are appropriating money to encourage travel in their own states. They are appealing to their nationals, for instance, to fish in Wisconsin rather than in Ontario or Quebec or British Columbia or wherever it may be in Canada. We are certainly in a highly competitive field and I think it is sensible that we have increased our advertising. We have made advertising more attractive by the use of colour. Members of this committee who are interested in travel movies know that the day of the black and white picture is gone. To be attractive, a travel movie has got to be made in colour. Magazine advertising has reached the same stage. We have to compete with Southern California, Wisconsin, Oregon, and other of the states of the Union which are spending large sums of money for colour advertising in national magazines. This year we will spend \$875,000 as against \$700,000 a year ago.

Our own publications have to be increased in numbers because more and more people are asking about Canada. Last year we spent \$208,000 and this year we intend to spend \$250,000 towards this end.

There is a small increase of salaries of about \$8,000, but the increase in the budget this year for the Travel Bureau is in advertising and in the publications. But we have gone into an expensive advertising campaign in the American newspapers. We have extended our newspaper advertising for several reasons. More newspapers in the United States are now carrying travel columns and have travel editors. When I was a newspaperman we never heard of a travel editor, but today every large American newspaper has one who runs a travel column. The result of this is that we get more publicity for Canada through travel columns than through any other form of public relations work. This is because the travel editor of the publication in the United States is asking for information. You are not asking him to publish it. As a newspaper publisher, Senator Buchanan will agree that if you want something published in a newspaper it is easier, if the editor asks for it than if you have to sell him on the idea of printing it. The life of an advertisement in a magazine is longer than that of an advertisement in a newspaper, but the continuity given in the newspaper is far better and certainly pays dividends for the money spent.

The CHAIRMAN: You will find more reading matter in the travel section of the daily newspaper than you would get in a magazine.

Mr. DOLAN: That is why we extended our newspaper advertising program. I continually keep in touch with newspaper editors suggesting this or that story that they might use, and then they put their research men on the job. It has taken me almost two years to convince the comparatively new magazine *Holiday* that they should write a full article on Canada. In August of this year *Holiday* magazine will have an exclusive story, from cover to cover, about Canada. It is the biggest travel magazine in the world today. It is published by the Curtis people who have poured a lot of money into it. Several small articles have been written about Canada but this will be a full-length article. We keep in touch with the editors of the Curtis publications, the Hearst publications and others and supply them with leads regarding stories they can use about Canada. There is seldom a month that goes by that some large magazine in the United States does not have a story about some part of Canada.

During the latter months of 1948 we established exclusive film libraries in the United States. In co-operation with the National Film Board and the National Parks Branch of the Department of Mines and Resources, we decided the time had come when there should be available to organizations in the United States who desire travel films, some libraries of modern up-to-date travel films on Canada. Most of our travel films in the United States at the present time are outdated. They were taken years ago and they show old cars and women's dresses that are obviously far out of style.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: That would be serious.

Mr. DOLAN: That may seem quite trivial but it is serious. As soon as Americans see a picture showing old-fashioned styles they say "Phooey, that's no good". A few years ago I would have made the same observation that you have made, Senator Roebuck. Americans are curious people. If you do not give them what they want you cannot get their business. We have established 62 libraries in the United States. We are going to add 5 or 6 films a year to our libraries and within a period of five years we are going to be able to say that there are 60 or 70 films in our libraries in the United States that can be secured by any club, organization or institute that wants to know something about this country. This is just a new project. It is perhaps not in perfect operation today, but if the provinces will be a little patient and let us get this thing going, at the end of five years, between the National Film Board and

ourselves, we shall have something Canada has never had before—adequate and modern travel film libraries in the United States. In addition we have been continuing making our sports films dealing with fishing and other sports. We are making sports films to be shown to the different sportmen clubs in the United States. Our films are all made with the idea that conservation is the thing that is going to maintain our fishing streams and lakes. Years ago we used to make sports films, and Senator Pirie—I do not think I served under him because he was in opposition when I worked for the Government of New Brunswick—knows that some of our films showed people holding up an extravagant catch of fish. That has proven to be bad propaganda. We do not promote anything like that now. The idea now is that if you are going to participate in the sport you must be a sportsman yourself. You have to keep the idea of conservation in your mind. But we are distributing some of our sport films through *Field and Stream* magazine. These films too are coloured.

Mr. Walkinshaw said that some of his associates in the anglers' club thought that tourist fishermen should not be allowed to come into this country. Naturally, I cannot agree with that. Besides—and I say this with sincere regret—I think the tourist angler and the tourist hunter have been better conservationists and have obeyed our fish and game laws to a far greater degree than have many of our own people.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: There is no question about that.

Mr. DOLAN: To say that tourist sportsmen are depleting our rivers, lakes and streams is nothing but pure nonsense and buncombe. Last year the Ontario Government's revenue from licenses issued to non-resident anglers was \$1,123,000. Resident anglers are not charged anything at all for a license. In 1947 the number of anglers who came into the province was 191,000. I have not go the 1948 figures.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You mean that those anglers came to Ontario from the United States and bought fishing licenses?

Mr. DOLAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: And they paid for those licenses the amount that you have stated?

Mr. DOLAN: Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: Have you any way of estimating the total amount of money those people spent here?

Mr. DOLAN: It is pretty safe to estimate an average expenditure of ten to fifteen times the angling licence fee, and I think those people would have spent close to \$20 million here. Senator Pirie was for a good many years Minister of Lands and Mines in New Brunswick. He is very familiar with the lakes, rivers and streams which attract tourists to that province, and I think he will bear me out that the average tourist angler spends while here an average of at least ten to twelve times the amount of the license fee. He has to pay for guides, and he buys gasoline and food, and he usually is a good customer of the provincial Liquor Control Board.

In Ontario a year ago there were 16,000 non-resident hunters, but the number of residents who took out hunting licenses was 220,000. I think the proportion of resident to non-resident anglers would be about the same. If I am right in this, a simple calculation will show that the number of residents who fish in the province is a very large one.

We have tried to attract outside anglers to the province and to direct them to places where they can get good fishing. I agree with some things that Mr. Walkinshaw said and for nearly twenty years I have been preaching them up and down the country. Maybe it is because I am a proud New Brunswicker, but whatever the reason I have urged in all parts of Canada that guides should

form themselves into provincial associations similar to the one in New Brunswick. The late Harry Allan established that association away back in 1898, I think, and it is doing down there some of the things that Mr. Walkinshaw says should be done elsewhere. As Senator Pirie knows, the guides in New Brunswick have been largely responsible for improvement in the fishing lodges in that province. The day is gone, Mr. Chairman, when the sportsman who comes to Canada wants to rough it. The way he wants to "rough it" nowadays is on good spring mattresses in clean rooms and in dining rooms where good food is served. There are no more tourists who want to sleep on a bunch of boughs, and no guide worthy of the name will operate under the conditions that prevailed in the horse and buggy days.

The CHAIRMAN: Some tourists who come to this country like to rough it a bit.

Mr. DOLAN: The Trail Riders out in your own province, Mr. Chairman, are a striking example of that, but the great mass of tourists want to enjoy their holiday in comfort. I would like to see a guides association in every province. In such an association the guides discipline themselves. If properly officered and directed the association will become the finest possible force for the conservation of wild life. That is only reasonable, because after all a guide is a capitalist who sets himself up in business to service sportsmen, and he would be a very stupid fellow if he allowed sportsmen to come in and ruin his business by taking more than the legally permissible number of fish or game or by being careless with fires or otherwise destructive. That would be ridiculous, just as it would be if Senator Duffus, who has a prosperous automobile business, allowed people to make a practice of taking out cars, tearing them to pieces and bringing them back in exchange for new ones. The guides in New Brunswick have through their organization disciplined not only themselves but also sportsmen. Greater emphasis has got to be placed on the conservation of our wild life, and an educational program with this end in view needs to be carried on throughout the country.

The CHAIRMAN: Are the guides organized in any other province?

Mr. DOLAN: I do not know of any other, Mr. Chairman. There used to be a splendid organization in Nova Scotia, but it went out of existence during the war. They used to attend sportsmen's shows in colourful costumes, as the New Brunswick guides did. I think an attempt was made to organize an association in Saskatchewan a few years ago; as I recall, they asked for some suggestions from the New Brunswick guides. Senator Horner may know about this.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: It seems to me that there was a proposal for an association.

Mr. DOLAN: This year we are also expanding our program of exhibits at travel shows in the United States. We have two exhibits that will travel to Chicago, Milwaukee, Minneapolis and Dallas, Texas, and also to San Francisco, Seattle and Los Angeles, that is in the areas from which we principally hope to attract traffic to the midwest and on the Pacific Coast. Last year we exhibited at shows in New York and Detroit. What we are trying to do is put on exhibits in eastern and western areas in alternate years.

Also, this year we are considering joining with the Junior Chamber of Commerce in an educational program of our own. We are issuing what we call a Travel School Manual. I had hoped to have copies of it this morning, but unfortunately the Printing Bureau is so pressed with work that it has been unable to supply copies yet. The manual is something new for our bureau. For some time we have felt there was a great need in Canada for educating the public as to (1) the economics of the travel industry, (2) the emphasizing of certain things that are typically Canadian, such as foods, accommodation, architecture and so on, and (3) the need for treating tourists with courtesy and

fairness at all times. We have been working on the manual for about a year and it will be distributed as soon as copies are received from the Printing Bureau. It will be made available to junior chambers of commerce, schools, colleges, resort organizations, oil companies and the like. It might be described in brief as a book of lectures on the travel business. Our object is to establish throughout Canada a public consciousness of the importance of the travel industry.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Will a copy of the manual be sent to each member of the committee?

Mr. DOLAN: Yes, senator, I shall make sure of that.

The only other matter that I have to mention is the Dominion Provincial Tourist Conference, which was held in Ottawa last week. Some years ago when I appeared before this committee questions were asked about what co-operation we were receiving from the provinces, and after that we decided to hold a Dominion Provincial Tourist Conference annually. I have mailed a copy of the last report to every member of the committee. It gives a summary of what the provinces, the transportation interests and the federal government are trying to do in the way of establishing a national tourist program. By means of this co-operative effort we are able to prevent much overlapping and duplication.

The CHAIRMAN: What was the estimated revenue from the tourist industry last year?

Mr. DOLAN: \$282 million, of which \$270 million came from the United States.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that estimate made by the Bureau of Statistics?

Mr. DOLAN: Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: Are they still including all the people who travel back and forth between Detroit and Windsor and other border points?

Mr. DOLAN: No, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: You remember the point that was brought up when Dr. Marshall was here last year?

Mr. DOLAN: Yes. The present figure has to do with legitimate tourists only. A further check is now made possible by the operations of the Foreign Exchange Control Board.

Mr. WALKINSHAW: Mr. Chairman, may I just say another word? This may be of interest to Mr. Dolan in the future. The other day an American was telling me that in the United States now they have all their battlefields, sites of massacres, beauty spots and so on well marked, and tourists are encouraged to visit these places. The result is that when a tourist goes to any part of the country looking for, say, fish and does not happen to have any luck, he will not go back home with a grouch if he can tell his friends that he and his wife were on the very field where such and such a famous battle was fought or where there was a great massacre. Perhaps more of Mr. Dolan's advertising should call attention to some of the famous historic sites that we have in this country.

Mr. DOLAN: We have a National Historic Sites and Monuments Board in Canada, and while we have not followed the example of, say, Virginia, which has sold nothing but its history and done it very successfully, we have done a little along this line. However, we must do much more. The manual that I mentioned a few moments ago has a lecture on historic sites in the community. Our historic sites constitute one of the most profitable assets of our tourist industry.

The CHAIRMAN: I have heard some criticism about the way in which our historic sites are marked. People who have travelled to Montana for instance, have told me that in that state the tourists can read the inscriptions on monu-

ments and things of that kind without leaving the highway. They have, probably on a board, very handsomely done, a notice that "At this place such-and-such a battle took place"—something of that sort. However, we have to drive in, and the type on the brass tablet is very small; people really have to get out of their cars and walk around to find out what it is about. Have you heard any remarks on that matter?

Mr. DOLAN: Yes, I have heard that same criticism, Mr. Chairman. I would like to see us be a little more flamboyant in connection with our historic sites. We have got so many of them and so much history that I think we have been too shy and too retiring in saying the things we should say about our history. In fact we are too retiring, too shy about this country generally; and we in the tourist business find that our friends across the line are not given to that shyness, that retiring attitude of mind that we have in Canada. It is time that we Canadian people started to boast about this country a great deal more and glorify some of the things that have made this a great land.

The CHAIRMAN: What I have in mind in that connection is this; there is a monument down here near Prescott: my recollection is that for anybody to make out what is on the monument you have to drive in, get off the road; whereas I know that in Montana they flaunt these things before you in large type and you do not even have to get out of the car. I think if we could introduce some method of that kind it would be a good thing.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: I do not suppose you would care to commit yourself on the great benefits of the Trans-Canada Highway being placed on the northern route?

Mr. DOLAN: I am afraid, Senator Horner, you are not going to catch me on that,—not yet.

The CHAIRMAN: Now tell us about the complaints you get. You get complaints about roads?

Mr. DOLAN: I would say that 95 per cent of the complaints we get are about conditions on our highways. Last year we circularized with a questionnaire some 68,000 people who wrote us. The results of that questionnaire are now being compiled; and at least 90 per cent, nearly 95 per cent of the complaints were about conditions of highways in Canada: the rest of the comment was so favourable that it almost made you blush. Some comments were far more enthusiastic about our own country than we are ourselves. They speak of our courtesy, they speak of the attractions, scenic and otherwise, and the fine treatment they received. The only complaint—the whole thread was the complaint about our highways.

The CHAIRMAN: What about meals and accommodation?

Mr. DOLAN: There was some complaint about that, but not as much as there used to be three or four years ago, when we circularized the people who wrote us. Without offence, Senator Horner, I think the meals on the Canadian railways are better than the meals in the United States, with the exception of the Santa Fe.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: That is not what Americans tell me, nor my experience when I was last down there.

Mr. DOLAN: We have not had a letter complaining about meals on dining cars in all the years I have been here, and I am now starting the sixteenth year.

The CHAIRMAN: What about over-charging for accommodation?

Mr. DOLAN: There has been some complaint about that, and if you will ask the press not to mention the names of any provinces, I will say there was considerable complaint about over-charging in the province of Quebec last year, particularly in the rooming-houses, that they jumped up \$8, \$9 and \$10 a

night. We had considerable complaint about that. Mostly in the other provinces conditions are pretty fair: I ought to say that when a complaint was brought to the attention of the Quebec government they acted with dispatch; and the result of the legislation they have on the books has been to rectify that situation, and they did it very quickly.

The CHAIRMAN: These people who operate cabin camps and restaurants are all under provincial or municipal licensing, are they not?

Mr. DOLAN: Yes, and they are getting more strict every year. You may have noticed that yesterday or the day before the Ontario government brought in some new legislation to restrict the operations of people who are giving tourist information. A lot of people put up the sign "Tourist Information": you drive in there, but not only can they not give you information, but what they give you is misinformation, and that creates an awful lot of trouble. So the Ontario government, wisely, I think, have introduced legislation that permission must be received from either the provincial government or the municipality before anyone can advertise that they give information. Again, we are in competition with the type of service they are getting in Minnesota and Michigan and other border states, where they are right on their toes to see that the tourist is given the proper type of information, the proper sort of accommodation, and everything. This is a very competitive business, and we have got to improve a number of things in this country,—our accommodations, amongst them, and the type of tourist information bureaus. But we think in general the big problem confronting Canada's travel industry is the matter of highways.

The CHAIRMAN: You do not want to commit yourself on the question asked by Senator Horner, but you do feel that the completion of the Trans-Canada Highway, no matter what route it takes, is highly important in the development of the tourist business?

Mr. DOLAN: One of the greatest assets Canada can possibly have. I would hate to have anybody estimate the hundreds of millions of dollars we have lost because we have not had a Trans-Canada Highway. And you must bear this in mind, that if you are going to have a Trans-Canada Highway attention must be given to the feeder lines, particularly from the southern border points. There is not much use having a Trans-Canada Highway unless you have feeder lines to bring in tourists from the areas from which they are coming up to it.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Well, Mr. Chairman, I hold a somewhat contrary view as regards the Trans-Canada Highway. But first, in regard to accommodation: my observation leads me to the conclusion that the accommodation for tourists is steadily improving.

Mr. DOLAN: That is right.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: A few years ago, when we were new in this business, in a great many cases it was very crude, and there was over-charging, and the food was poor. But I had occasion, for instance, in Nova Scotia last summer in two places to spend the night in each case at a so-called tourist cabin. You have a comfortable bed, hot and cold running water, good food, not lavish but well prepared, and cleanliness was the order of the day. It was just the sort of place where someone coming in might say, "Well, I am going to stay here for three or four days. The accommodation is excellent." It is improving, I think, in our national parks. We need to keep continuously before the people the importance of wholesome food, well prepared, not lavish; cleanliness, and good sleeping accommodation. I expect that there will continue to be a steady improvement.

Now, about the Trans-Canada Highway. There is a great deal of talk about that now, and it does look as if we were going to be committed to building

probably a hard-surface Trans-Canada Highway, because any other kind of highway is not of much value for tourists, particularly Americans.

Mr. DOLAN: No good at all, sir.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Now, if we do that, and you calculate the cost, it means that our energies and our expenditures for the next five or ten years will be devoted to a Trans-Canada Highway, mainly at any rate. Now the important thing so far as getting tourist traffic from the United States is concerned is to get good roads leading from the United States up into the northern parts of our country.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: No doubt about that.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: There is no doubt about that. I found that, for instance, when I was in the Department of Mines and Resources, and we got a little vote up to the outbreak of the war, during 1937, 1938 and 1939, for tourist roads, which money we spent under agreement with the provinces, the provinces contributing a certain amount. That was a burning question. For instance, in British Columbia, where we have some of the finest national parks in the world, I discovered that American tourists would come in over a dusty highway, travel maybe five or ten miles, and then turn back and go home. Now, that is true all over. We must bear in mind that the United States is away in advance of where we are in the matter of roads, and the American tourist coming to Canada can travel on a hard-surfaced dustless road until he reaches the Canadian boundary, from almost everywhere.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Alongside almost every province. That is true in relation to every province.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Yes, that is true of every province. Most of the roads leading up from the boundary are of rough gravel and dusty, and as far as tourist traffic is concerned—and that is a big item if we develop it properly—the Trans-Canada Highway, on which we are to spend a lot of money, will not be “one-two-three” in its appeal.

Hon. Mr. PIRIE: But you have got to have the Trans-Canada Highway first to encourage travel on the other roads.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: I am not so sure.

Hon. Mr. PIRIE: What would be the good of the other roads coming in unless you had a perfect Trans-Canada Highway?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Very good: let us look at that. You have the Trans-Canada Highway paved: a tourist comes into Manitoba and travels over a dusty road until he gets to the Trans-Canada Highway, which ultimately may be hard-surfaced. Now there are not many of these tourists that come in there who are going to go either to Vancouver or Ottawa or Montreal over a Trans-Canada Highway. They have not got the time. Most of these people who come in are fellows who have a couple of weeks' holiday. They may be lawyers or doctors or teachers or, very often, bank managers, that type of visitor, who has maybe two weeks' holiday, and what he wants to do is to come to where he can fish or play golf or see animals, and go back home. Now these people are not going to travel across the Trans-Canada Highway for thousands of miles when they want to go somewhere for a rest.

Hon. Mr. PIRIE: But these roads, from the border, Senator Crerar, are a provincial responsibility, are they not?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: That is true; but I will say this, that in 1936, 1937, 1938 and 1939 we made arrangements with the provinces, and every province was concerned, and we said to them, “We will put up fifty-fifty with you if you will build the roads in a certain place and to a certain standard”; and that arrangement was carried out. It is true that we received only a few million dollars each

year, and could not go very far, but we utilized the provincial machinery for making roads, and all that was done by the Department of Mines and Resources was to put one man in each province to see that the terms of the agreement were carried out in building its road. That resulted over those four years in the construction of several hundred miles of hard-surface roads.

The CHAIRMAN: That policy is not in operation now.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: No, but it could be resumed. I agree with Senator Pirie, that the building of certain roads are a provincial responsibility. We have centred our ideas on the Trans-Canada highway, and it is of course a desirable thing.

Hon. Mr. ROSS: That is a provincial responsibility. In fact, all roads are provincial responsibilities.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: This is being pushed onto the federal government. As far as the federal expenditures are concerned we are going to confine it to the Trans-Canada highway. When it is built you will be surprisingly disappointed at the small number of people who will travel over it, compared to those who travel other roads.

Mr. Walkinshaw gave us some very interesting thoughts and information today. Take the province of Manitoba, which Senator Haig and I know pretty well, in 1936 and 1937 we connected a link of road between what is known as the Swan River Valley to the north route going to The Pas and Flin Flon, a distance of a hundred miles. That was completed in 1938, and in that fall I walked down the main street of The Pas one day in September—that is about 450 or 500 miles northwest of Winnipeg—and I counted 21 American cars parked against the curb. Some of those cars were from as far away as California. Mr. Walkinshaw was telling us about the way Americans fly here for duck and geese shooting near James Bay. There are scores of Americans who come in from St. Paul and Minneapolis by motor car and go to The Pas, where for a month of the year there is the finest duck and goose shooting in Canada; they also go up to shoot deer. If we give these people good roads they will come in not by the scores, but by the hundreds, and whether they spend \$100 or \$1,000 is a mere bagatelle to them; they are well-to-do people who drive here in Cadillac cars.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: In Ontario we have a bonded road to New Liskeard and the Temiskaming district, and I do not think there is an army of tourists travel on it.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: I do not know about that.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: It goes through North Bay and up to Cobalt, Haileybury, New Liskeard and other towns.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Just after the Liberal convention last year, at the beginning of August, I visited the Highlands Park in Cape Breton. It is one of the most beautiful places in Canada because of the ocean; it is a very expensive project, and will take a few years to complete. The manager of that park told me that half of the people registered there were Americans.

Hon. Mr. PIRIE: We all agree that what the tourist needs is good roads.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: What we have done in Canada in this respect has amazed everyone who visits here. We have built our highways paralleling our railways. In western Canada the people in certain sections will have a good road and a railway, while others will have neither a railway nor a highway. As Senator Crerar has said, our Trans-Canada highway will be paralleling our railways; and eventually there will be huge truck traffic competing with the railway for the commercial trade. As far as its effect on tourist traffic, it will be fifteen years before the road is completed to any standard.

Senator Crerar spoke about assistance required for our parks. While I was at Prince Albert Park last year I was amazed at the fine accommodation that could be secured at a reasonable cost there. The American people would swamp that accommodation every year if they could just get a good highway to it; they do not like the dust. The provincial government are doing what they can; they are paving the road from Prince Albert to the park, a distance of eighty miles, but it is requiring a lot of money. They are building a 44-foot road, with a 200-foot right-of-way. This is a feature that the Trans-Canada highway does not require; it does not need to be more than 24 feet wide, but it must be paved.

Hon. Mr. PIRIE: For instance, if an American crosses at Seattle to Vancouver today, with a view to motoring across Canada, he cannot get a straight route to the Maritimes. I am more in favour of keeping up the arteries from the American side than I am in the construction of the Trans-Canada highway. Of course, I think we need them both.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Eventually we will have them both, but, as Senator Crerar said, the need now is for roads into our parks.

Hon. Mr. PIRIE: I think if we give them a Trans-Canada highway, the provinces will look after the arteries coming in.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any more questions to be asked of Mr. Dolan?

Hon. Mr. DUFFUS: I think he has done very well.

The CHAIRMAN: We are very grateful to Mr. Dolan and to the other witnesses who have appeared before us today. A good deal of valuable and thought-provoking information has been received.

The committee then adjourned, to resume at the call of the Chair.

## Appendix "B"

### THE ESTIMATED VALUE OF SPORTS FISHING TO CANADA

By

W. D. B. Reid

#### *Abstract*

The information on sport fishing, collected to date, suggests that its monetary value to Canada lies somewhere between \$15,000,000 and \$25,000,000 per year.

#### *Some Difficulties*

The data, however, offer no sound basis for a precise estimate of that portion of national income which is directly attributable to this source. Some of the difficulties involved may be noted:

(1) The failure of the provincial authorities to record the percentage of Americans among those securing non-resident licences.

(a) The possibility that some of these visitors, when securing licences, gave the addresses of residents with whom they were staying.

(3) The lack of a reliable estimate of the average amount spent by an angler during his stay.

(4) The scarcity of information which might suggest what portion of the tourists, who secured licences, came primarily to fish.

#### *Direct Revenue*

With reference to the first of these points, fairly complete figures on the actual number of non-residents licences issued were available for the years 1939, 1940 and 1941. The latter year is abnormally high for reasons to be mentioned later. Approximately 87,000 non-residents licences were issued in

1939 and in 1940. This netted the various provincial governments close to \$482,000 per year in direct revenue, of which Ontario received about \$385,000 (Appendix A). Further income may have been obtained from fishing leases: New Brunswick gained \$70,000 yearly from these (Appendix B2), though no figures are available for other provinces. Other direct revenue resulted from that portion of the licence fee which the licensor retained and not reported in revenue figures—probably \$35,000 a year in Ontario (Appendix B1). In all it seems safe to suggest that the Dominion obtained between \$600,000 and \$700,000 per year from such direct sources as those mentioned.

#### *Estimated Number of American Anglers*

Just what proportion of this was attributable to foreign tourists is difficult to estimate. However, there seems to be general agreement that the major portion of non-resident licences went to Americans. In view of the fact that Ontario issued a Manitoba resident licence—about 1 per cent of the total number of non-resident licences (Appendix B1)—the probability is that almost all of the remaining non-resident licences of this province were issued to Americans. Since Ontario attracted the major portion of migrant anglers, it seems reasonable to suppose that, of the total number of non-resident licences mentioned above, roughly 80,000 were issued to American visitors. This figure then may be fairly representative of the number of sport fishermen that were entering Canada each year. This might be considered a maximum value, partially offset by the second difficulty mentioned at the beginning.

A further complication arises, however, from the fact that a portion of the total number of non-resident licences issued were family licences. Ontario sold 20,000 a year (Appendix B1)—each licence being regarded as equivalent to  $\frac{1}{2}$  anglers. However, most of these were probably bought by people who owned cottages and did not visit the province solely for fishing. Each family licence will be regarded as equivalent to a single angler.

#### *Estimated Expenditure of Anglers*

It is very difficult to ascertain from available data the amount these anglers might have actually spent during their visit to Canada. Authorities concerned seem very hesitant in making any definite suggestion. This is unfortunately the case in Ontario. What estimates were obtained indicate very high expenditures in the Maritimes, or for tourists reaching fishing resorts by rail. However, it is conceivable that most Ontario anglers came by car, and probably did not spend as much as in Quebec or the Maritimes.

It is suggested that for an average ten days each fisherman spent \$200 or more in Quebec or New Brunswick (Appendix C1). A value of \$130 was indicated for British Columbia (Appendix C2). This last figure seems to be closer to what might have been the average amount for Ontario. On this basis minimum and maximum estimates of \$125 can be set up. From these the value (including direct revenue) of sport fishing to the Dominion might have been, in former years, between \$11,000,000 and \$19,000,000 a year. These figures would be further supplemented by expenditures on private clubs and residences, of which no estimates exist.

A further increase of revenue in 1941 resulted from the issuance of short period licences in Ontario. Forty-two thousand were sold and \$4,000,000 seems a very liberal allowance for their total value.

#### *Conclusion*

From the above, it appears that the work of this tourist attraction to Canada (on a peace time basis with provincial government policy remaining as before) can be assumed to lie between \$15,000,000 and \$23,000,000 per year. Certainly \$23,000,000 can be designated as the maximum value.

## APPENDIX L - B - A

## ANGLING LICENSES

Province	No. of non-resident licences	Revenue	No. of non-resident licences	Revenue
Prince Edward Island .....	60	60		
Nova Scotia .....	630	2,973	859	4,050
New Brunswick .....	2,627	17,790	2,503	17,740
Quebec .....	8,400	52,598	7,372	49,895
Ontario .....	66,226	384,675	66,949	387,020
Manitoba .....	1,214	1,418	1,041	1,086
Saskatchewan .....	1,558	2,461	1,935	3,103
Alberta .....	157	353	81	182
British Columbia .....	6,630	18,992	6,771	18,753
Total .....	87,502	\$481,320	87,511	\$481,828

## APPENDIX L - B - B

## (1) Department of Game and Fisheries, Ontario

Number of Ontario Licences:	Individual	Family	Resident of Manitoba
1939 .....	45,138	21,475	578
1940 .....	44,095	21,414	717
Cost to angler .....	\$5.50	\$8.00	\$3.25
Revenue to Dept. .....	5.00	7.50	3.00

## (a) Province of New Brunswick (Chief Game Warden).

Revenue from	Annual Salmon Angling Leases	Annual Trout Angling Leases
1939 .....	\$68,774	\$2,575
1940 .....	68,174	2,360

## APPENDIX L - B - C

(1) New Brunswick (Chief Game Warden): \$20 a day for an average 10 day stay.

(2) British Columbia (Provincial Game Commissioner): \$13 per day for an average 10 day stay.

(3) General (Tourist Agent, Canadian National Railways): Average value \$200 (including licence fee) per stay.